



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/541,458	03/31/2000	AMIT CHATTERJEE	1018.060US1	3666

7590 01/16/2003

STEPHEN A. WRIGHT  
ONE WORLD TRADE CENTER  
121 S. W. SALMON STREET  
SUITE 1600  
PORTLAND, OR 97204

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

WALLACE, SCOTT A

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2671

DATE MAILED: 01/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/541,458	CHATTERJEE, AMIT
	Examiner Scott Wallace	Art Unit 2671

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 October 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 22 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 24-26 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All
  - b) Some \*
  - c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
  - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>5</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**Art Unit: 2671**

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 22-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kay et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,37,269 in view of Boyer, U.S. Patent No. 5,295,200.

4. As per claim 22, Kay et al discloses a computer comprising: a display (fig. 13); a function designed to display a transparent image on the display, the function caching a mask for the image and a transformation of the image used for displaying the image, such that subsequent calls to the function for displaying the image omit regenerating the mask and retransforming the image (column 2 lines 10-27 and column 3 lines 30-34) and an application program designed to call the function a plurality of times to display the image at different location on the display (column 1 lines 24-34). However, Kay et al does not disclose using a class library. This is disclosed in Boyer in column 6 lines 56-65. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the subroutines (class library) of Boyer with the system of Kay et al because this would have made the system semi-automated having most of the work done by the software.

5. As per claim 23, Boyer discloses wherein the class library comprises at least one computer program executed by a processor of the computer from a computer-readable medium thereof (column 6 lines 56-65).

**Art Unit: 2671**

6. As per claim 24, Kay et al discloses wherein the function further generates the mask such that the mask has a plurality of pixels corresponding to the plurality of pixels of transparent image, such that each pixel of the mask that corresponds to a transparent pixel of the image is set to a first predetermined color, and every other pixel of the mask is set to a second predetermined color (column 5 lines 5-15 and 60-63 and column 6 lines 25-33).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claims 25-26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

8. Claims 1-21 are allowed.

9. The prior art of record fails to disclose generating a mask of a transparent image such that each pixel of the mask that corresponds to a transparent pixel is set to a first predetermined color and every other pixel of the mask is set to a second predetermined color and transforming the image such that each pixel thereof that is transparent is set to the second predetermined color.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Scott Wallace** whose telephone number is **703-605-5163**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Mark Zimmerman**, can be reached at 703-305-9798.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

**Art Unit: 2671**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

**(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.



MARK ZIMMERMAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600